

Interview Summary of First Interview on March 23, 2010

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.133(b), please make of record this summary of the March 23, 2010 interview between Examiner Luk and the undersigned. The Applicant appreciates the opportunity given to interview Examiner Luk relative to the rejection of claims 1-12, 14-27, and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

During the interview, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0086079 to Kuo (hereinafter Kuo) was discussed. As set forth in greater detail below in the Remarks section, the undersigned respectfully asserted that Kuo fails to teach or suggest “a moveable, dimensionally stable part of said housing element” as claimed in independent claims 1, 14, 17, 20, 29, and 31. Upon preliminary review of Kuo, Examiner Luk indicated that Kuo might not teach or suggest “a moveable, dimensionally stable part” as claimed in the independent claims. As a result, the Examiner indicated, upon preliminary review during the interview, that independent claims 1, 14, 17, 20, 29, and 31 appear to be novel and non-obvious over Kuo.

Interview Summary of Second Interview on March 23, 2010

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.133(b), please make of record this summary of the April 23, 2010 interview between Examiner Luk and the undersigned. The Applicant appreciates the opportunity given to interview Examiner Luk relative to the rejection of claims 1-12, 14-27, and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

During the interview, the undersigned proposed amending the last clause of independent claim 1 to read as follows:

“wherein said housing space can be enlarged by moving a moveable, dimensionally stable part of said housing element ~~to generate~~ and the elastic mold part is stretchable by generating a low pressure in said housing space ~~to stretch the elastic mold part~~ for removing the object.”

The undersigned set forth that U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0086079 to Kuo (hereinafter Kuo) and German reference DE 900 554 to Hoos (hereinafter Hoos) fail to teach, or even suggest, “a moveable, dimensionally stable part of said housing element” as claimed in independent claim 1. Since this particular language of claim 1 remains unamended, even after the proposed amendment, the combination of Kuo and Hoos fails to teach, or even suggest, every element of amended independent claim 1. As such, even after the proposed amendment, the undersigned asserted that independent claim 1 is non-obvious over Kuo and Hoos. Upon preliminary review of the proposed amendment in light of Kuo and Hoos, Examiner Luk indicated that independent claim 1, as presented in the proposed amendment, overcomes the present rejection under §103 in view of Kuo and Hoos.

The undersigned also indicated that support for such an amendment can be found on page 3, lines 8-10 of the present application. Upon preliminary review, Examiner Luk indicated that this section of the application appeared to provide support for the proposed amendment.